

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 06/07/95 08/485,113 6646-108N4 EXAMINER 26M1/0626 DARBY & DARBY P.C. WOO,S 707 WILSHIRE BLVD 32ND FLOOR LOS ANGELES CA 90017 ART UNIT PAPER, NUMBER DATE MAILED: 06/26/97

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

Ō

Analysis No.

Application No. **08/485,113** 

Stella Woo

Applicant(s)

Katz

Office Action Summary Exam

Examiner

Group Art Unit 2605

X Responsive to communication(s) filed on <i>Mar 24, 1997</i>	·
☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal n in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respon application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of tin 37 CFR 1.136(a).	nd within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claims	
	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
X Claim(s) 18-20 and 22-29	
Claim(s)	
☐ Claims €	
Application Papers	
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	
The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by	the Examiner.
The proposed drawing correction, filed on is	
The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).	
All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been	
received.	
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)	
received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
*Certified copies not received:	
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 3	35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
Attachment(s)	
X Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)	
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413	
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES	

Serial Number: 08/485,113

Art Unit: 2605

LT

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 18-20, 22-26, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Szlam et al. (Szlam) in view of Riskin.

Szlam discloses an interface control system comprising:

call data means (ANI decoder 10a24; Fig. 5; col. 12, lines 29-39);

interface means (trunk interface unit 10 with message player MP; Fig. 2);

means for processing (data controller 15; col. 11, lines 1-14; col. 12, lines 60-66) coupled to live operator attended terminals (operator terminals 12);

means for storing (mainframe 16; col. 11, lines 12-23; col. 12, line 67 - col. 13, line 39).

Szlam differs from claims 18-20, 22-26, 29 in that it does not specify the use of DNIS or directly forwarding a call to a live operator when the remote terminal does not have the capability to digitally provide data. However, Riskin teaches the well known use of DNIS for selecting a particular format (col. 16, lines 21-26) and direct forwarding of a call from a rotary phone to a liver operator (col. 11, lines 5-17) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such well known call handling features within the system of Szlam.

Art Unit: 2605

3. Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam in view of Riskin, as applied to claims 18-20, 22-26, 29 above, and further in view of Ladd et al. (Ladd).

The combination of Szlam and Riskin differs from claims 27-28 in that it does not specify imposing time-based conditions. However, Ladd teaches the well known handling of calls according to time-of-day, day-of-week, etc. (col. 12, lines 13-16) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate the imposing of time-based conditions, as taught by Ladd, within the combination of Szlam and Riskin.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-20, 22-29 have been considered but are

- Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-20, 22-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-4395.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached at (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9508.

STELLA WOO PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 2600

June 23, 1997

J. L.